No. 89-1391 and No. 89-1392

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 1990

DR. IRVING RUST, et al. PETITIONERS

LOUIS W. SULLIVAN, SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

THE STATE OF NEW YORK, et al PETITIONERS

LOUIS W. SULLIVAN, SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ON PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

MOTION TO ALLOW COUNSEL TO REPRESENT CHILDREN UNBORN AND BORN ALIVE

> ALAN ERNEST COUNSEL FOR MOVANT

P.O. BOX 2963 RESTON, VA. 22090 (703) 437-1178

# CONTENTS

Interest of Counsel1
Summary of Argument1
Argument2
TOWN TOWN TOWN TO DICUM
THE UNBORN HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT
TO BE ESPECIALLY REPRESENTED BY
COUNCEL TO PROVE THEIR LIVES ARE
PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION2
1. MUP
THIS COURT EFFECTED AND MAINTAINS THE
DOD WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUT
TONALLY DEPLICTNG TO ALLOW COUNSEL TO
DEDDESENT THE UNBORN AND DEFEND THEIR
THE HALL THE HAMPED THE HASA
CONSTITUTION2
CONSTITUTION
2.
THIS COURT EFFECTED THE ROE V. WADE
WALLEY ON THE CONSTITUTIONALLY
PRODUCTNO MO ALLOW PRIOR NOTICE OF THE
CONCERTMENT ONA! CTANDARDS. THE BURDENS!
OR THE EVIDENCE WHICH IT USED TO INFER
THAT THE LIVES OF THE UNBORN ARE NOT
THAT THE LIVES OF THE ORDORN THE STATE OF TH
PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION5
3.
THIS COURT EFFECTED THE ROE V. WADE
KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUTIONALLY USING A
KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUTIONS TO FIND
SECRET EVIDENTIARY PROCESS TO FIND
EVIDENCE TO INFER THAT THE LIVES OF
THE UNBORN ARE NOT PROTECTED BY
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION9

THIS COURT EFFECTED AND MAINTAINS THE
ROE V. WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITU-
TIONALLY REPUSING TO ALLOW ITS
EVIDENCE, WHICH IT USED TO INFER THAT
THE LIVES OF THE UNBORN ARE NOT
THE LIVES OF THE UNDORN ARE NOT
PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, T
BE CONFRONTED AND CROSS-EXAMINED 1
5.
D. MATHERING THE
THIS COURT EFFECTED AND MAINTAINS THE
ROE V. WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITU-
TIONALLY REFUSING TO ALLOW EVIDENCE T
BE PRESENTED ON BEHALP OF THE UNBORN
TO ESTABLISH THEIR RIGHT TO LIFE UNDE
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
Issues Raised by Counsel for the
Unborn, Not Raised by the Parties1
1. THE UNIVERSAL GUARANTEE OF
LIFE TO "ANY PERSON," MADE IN THE U.S
CONSTITUTION, DOES INCLUDE THE
UNBORN1
ONDOWN TO THE PARTY OF THE PART
2. THERE IS A GOVERNMENT
CONSPIRACY TO IMPOSE ON THIS NATION
THE EXACT LEGAL DOCTRINES WHICH THE
UNITED STATES ITSELF CONDEMNED AS
MURDER AT NUREMBERG
Conclusion2

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:
Dred_Scott v. Sanford, 19 How. 3936
Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 2544
Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 4095
In_Re_Gault, 387 U.S. 14
United States v. Altstoetter, 3 Trials of War Criminals Before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals (1951)
Books:
4 Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln (Basler ed. 1953)6
Briefs Filed In This Court:
Amicus Curiae Brief by the Legal Defense for Unborn Children, filed in this case
Petition for Rehearing, Doe v. Bolton, 410 U.S. 179 (1973)
U.S. Constitution:
Sixth Amendment-"Assistance of Counsel"4
Pifth Amendment-"Due Process"4

## MOTION TO ALLOW COUNSEL TO REPRESENT CHILDREN UNBORN AND BORN ALIVE

The Court is moved to allow Alan

Ernest to represent the victims being

killed by Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113, as

counsel or guardian ad litem, for the

purpose of defending their right to life

under the U.S. Constitution.

#### INTEREST OF COUNSEL

Alan Ernest is a lawyer in the District of Columbia and a member of the bar of this Court. His purpose is to prove that the guarantee of life to "any person," made in the U.S. Constitution, does include the unborn.

This is effectively a motion to allow retained counsel since there will be no expense to this Court, or to the taxpayers.

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The unborn have a constitutional right to be especially represented by counsel to prove that their lives are specifically guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

## Argument

THE UNBORN HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO BE ESPECIALLY REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL TO PROVE THEIR LIVES ARE PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

THIS COURT EFFECTED AND MAINTAINED THE ROE V. WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUTIONALLY REFUSING TO ALLOW COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE UNBORN AND DEFEND THEIR RIGHT TO LIFE UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

counsel did not especially represent the unborn in the U.S. District Court, or at any stage in Ros v. Wade. An original party objected that the unborn should be represented by counsel in this Court:

(T)he Court should have every benefit of a complete record and the representation of a guardian ad litem for that fetal entity and for its 1 natural right to develop to birth.

But this Court refused to allow counsel to represent the unborn and defend their right to life under the U.S. Constitution. Thus the killings commenced.

And the Supreme Court has maintained the killings by steadfastly refusing to

<sup>1.</sup> Petition for Rehearing 5, Doe v. Bolton, 410 U.S. 179 (1973), denied 410 U.S. 959 (1973).

allow counsel to represent the unborn, and defend their right to life under the U.S. Constitution. 2

-R.D odd copies at the or day in charge

of paleotot vilenters in advance to a say

<sup>2.</sup> The Court has refused to allow counsel for the unborn in all its abortion cases. Some are: Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 437 U.S. 902; Anders v. Floyd, 440 U.S. 445, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 439 U.S. 890: Bellotti v. Baird, 443 U.S. 622, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 439 U.S. 1065: Ashcroft v. Freiman, affirmed 440 U.S. 941, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied, 440 U.S. 941; United States v. Zbaraz, 448 U.S. 358, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 444 U.S. 1030; Harris v. McRae, 448 U.S. 297, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 445 U.S. 941; H.L. v. Matheson, 450 U.S. 398, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 445 U.S. 959; Simopoulos v. Virginia, 462 U.S. 506, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 458 U.S. 1104; Planned Parenthood of Kansas City v. Ashcroft, 462 U.S. 476, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 458 U.S. 1104; Akron Center for Reproductive Health v. Akron, 462 U.S. 416, motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 458 U.S. 1104; Diamond v. Charles, 90 L Ed 2d 48 (1986), motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 87 L Ed 2d 704; Thornburgh v. American College of Obstetricians, 90 L Ed 2d 779 (1986), motion to allow counsel for the unborn denied 87 L Ed 2d 702; Hartigan v. Zbaraz, 98 L Ed 2d (1988), motion to allow counsel to for the unborn denied 93 L Ed 2d 697, and Webster v. Reproductive Health Services, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_ (1989).

bus tayloday and Jasserger of Leaneon walls

and their sicks to life under the U.S.

The same of the sa

or the unborn to all its abortion cases.

derived all U.S. 902) Anders v. Floyd, 400 U.S. 445, Mericon to .110w counsel for the unburn denied 119 U.S. 800; Religible v.

Dalid to the cut mapping at line 439 U.S.
Counded for the ompore dealed 439 U.S.
Letter addition to line at line 6 440

union visit in the same of the same water of the same of the same

to miles counsel for the unborn denied 645.

wolls or not see \_200 with the controlly .a.u. first water denter with the control of the world .a.u.

Anteriors for the interior dented ASD U.G.

1104; Absentance for the interior dented ASD U.G.

1.04; Absentance for the interior dented to dillow
course the test described the U.G.

one and leading wells of marine (see it

he is the second to be a second of the secon

The believe of the the unborn dealed and the transfer of the transfer of dealed the transfer of the transfer o

The unborn have a constitutional right to be represented by counsel in this case to defend their right to life under the U.S. Constitution. Judges who willfully

3. Even in civil proceedings, where crucial deprivations are threatened, such as loss of welfare, due process guarantees (1) prior notice of the factual and legal bases; (2) the right to be represented by counsel; (3) the right to confront and cross-examine adverse evidence; (4) the right to present evidence. Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254, 268-271 (1970). See also, In Re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).

could it be possible that procedures, which could not be used to deprive a mother of welfare, could be used to exclude her from the protection of the U.S. Constitution so that she could be killed with impunity from criminal laws? This is preposterous.

The Constitution would not permit any court to condemn even one single Jew to death in a criminal case, but deny any of these procedural rights. Then neither can it permit any court to condemn all Jews in the United States to death, but deny any of these procedural rights, by calling it a civil proceeding, and decreeing the lives of all Jews are not protected by the U.S. Constitution, and it is "liberty" to kill all Jews with impunity from criminal laws.

Any victim is entitled to all these procedural protections before any court can decree that the victim's life is not protected by the Constitution, and the victim can be killed with impunity from criminal statutes. The rule for one is the rule for all; these are the sacred truth-seeking procedures which protect the lives

of all Americans.

The unboun have a constitutional right

to be represented by counsel in this case

defend their right to life under the

v.E. Conneiturion. dudges who willfully

geen in civil proceedings where clucked april as loss t welfare, due process quarentes (1)

rior notice of the factual and legs.

cross-examine adverse evidence: (4) the right to present evidence, Edidizio v.

also, in ap goalt, 307 G.S. 1 (1967).

Could to be possible that procedures.

Tod Shalpes of Daug on Broom . staffon to delication of the D.B. Constitution of the D.B. Constitution

The standard at start the start and start and the start and the start and st

the united states to death, but your env of theme proceedings and doubtening the attention of the course the state of the course the state of the course the state of the course the course

Committee was a state of the st

and, the funitorizated and and second

rule for ally those are the secret each-

deny this right are guilty of crime. 4 This denial makes Roe v. Wade void.

THIS COURT EFFECTED THE ROE v. WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUTIONALLY REFUSING TO ALLOW PRIOR NOTICE OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS, THE BURDENS OF PROOF, OR THE EVIDENCE WHICH IT USED TO INFER THAT THAT THE LIVES OF THE UNBORN ARE NOT PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

The District Court in Roe v. Wade did not even look to see if the lives of the unborn were protected by the Constitution. This question was argued for the first time after the case reached this Court. Since this Court had never previously excluded anyone from the protection of the U.S. Constitution so they could be killed with impunity from criminal statutes, the parties had no prior notice of the factual and legal bases for such an exclusion.

Moreover in the aftermath of <u>Dred</u>

<u>Scott</u> v. <u>Sanford</u>, legitimate public

<sup>4. &</sup>quot;Even judges ... could be punished criminally for willful deprivations of constitutional rights." Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409 (1976).

deny this right are guilty of crime. This depist water water and:

THIS COURT STREETS THE ROB V. WADE ILLIAMS BY CHOOSING TO ALLOW PRICE MOVICE OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL

The Bishriet Court to Ena V. Mada 616

unboth wars proceeded by the Constitution.

sonis . James mids bedoms - no sit tough

"S'A sut to notablished and sout such alle

but esstudies landales most velacont

and leggt been for such an exclusion,

Sileng timiting . Bacless .v gang

er mineral continue of continu

expectation rested on the assurance that
this Court would never again attempt
another exception to the universal terms
"any person." 5

This Court's decision in Dred Scott v. Sanford appears to be the only precedent in American history in which this Court has implied an exception to the universal terms "any person" in the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments. The Court there ruled that the universal words "any person" did not include Negroes, there was a constitutional right to own a slave, and Congress could not prohibit slavery in the free territories. This decision triggered a civil war. Candidate Abraham Lincoln vowed he would not obey Dred Scott. Opponents said their states would withdraw from the Union rather than be deprived of their assumed constitutional right to own slaves and take them to the free territories. 4 Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln 267 (1953). But President Abraham Lincoln responded that if he were bound by Dred Scott, "the people will have ceased to be their own rulers." Id., at 268. Thus the war commenced.

A purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment was to overrule <u>Dred Scott</u>, and place it beyond the power of judges to ever again produce convulsions by implying an exception the universal words "any person." For over a century legitimate public expectation rested on the assurance that this Court would never again attempt an exception to the universal terms "any person."

expectation rested on the asporance that

this Court would never again attempt

wise Court's sectsion in Bred Scott V.

Accordance. The Court there ruled that the

and profiler slovery in the line

divid war, Candidate Apreham Lincoln vowed

assumed remarks of long! right to own slaves and teller them to the free tellitories.

But without any prior notice, this Court once again, in the precise manner of Dred Scott, attempted to imply an exception to the universal words "any person." In Roe v. Wade, this Court thus combined both total surprise and violent defiance of the long standing legitimate public expectation that never again would this Court violate the universal words "any person."

In particular, this Court gave the parties in Roe v. Wade no prior notice of the constitutional standards, the burdens of proof, or the evidence, which the Court used to infer that the universal words "any person," as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, did not include the unborn.

The first time the parties had notice was when Roe v. Wade was published, and the victims were already condemned to death. An original party objected that it lacked the prior notice needed to defend the unborn:

Tourt open agista, in the practat mether of Court open agista, in the practat mether of grad, sate sages of grad, sate sages of the to the practat and exception to the universal vocasi any retuon." In Act of Hills that the the committed both total sates and vigitant abus committed both total sates and vigitant abus of the

topo; standing lagitimate public expectation cast topo; standing lagitimate public expectation

to solten very on shall we man of and

denograped and all Lots on Passages.

-district of paragraph of paragraph and and and and

our dangers or determine source yet in any

(N)ot only did the Court set a new constitutional standard, but at the same\_moment\_the Court\_applied\_the standard\_without\_giving\_the\_Appellees notice or opportunity to present evidence with respect to the point in gestation at which such standards, if they be correct as a matter of law in the first place, should be applied. "Viability", "meaningful life" or existence, "fetal life": all presumably have medical meaning which should be subject to medical testimony before a decision of constitutional import becomes solidified in concrete. These concepts are not even necessarily the appropriate ones. 6

But this Court refused to allow the original parties to have prior notice. Thus the killings commenced.

And this Court has maintained the killings despite repeated objections that the unborn had no prior notice in Roe v.

Wade of the factual and legal basis needed to defend the unborn's right to life under the U.S. Constitution.

<sup>6.</sup> Petition for Rehearing 6, <u>Doe</u> v. <u>Bolton</u>, 410 U.S. 179 (1973), denied 410 U.S. 959 (1973). (emphasis added).

See cases in note 2, supra.

iwher convert to the point ast. a new gonetices in the Court applied the standard but at the same applied the standard to the point in they be covered as a matter of law in the first place, should be applied.

doids painses isolbes even videsusein vanitude isolbes of project of blooms

and wolle of bonders truck with the street to allow the original poster of bolton the original poster or the Thus

That benished the ball the continue of the con

Colored at the Land Land Land Service Property and the same

The factor of the latest and the second

The unborn have a constitutional right to prior notice of all the factual and legal bases before they can be excluded from the protection of the Constitution so they can be killed with impunity from criminal statutes. Budges who willfully deny this right are guilty of crime. This denial makes Rog v. Wade void.

THIS COURT EFFECTED THE ROE v. WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUTIONALLY USING A SECRET EVIDENTIARY PROCESS TO FIND EVIDENCE TO INFER THAT THE LIVES OF THE UNBORN ARE NOT PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

This Court used some secret
evidentiary process, not open to the
parties, to find evidence to infer that the
lives of the unborn were not protected by
the U.S. Constitution. The Court conducted
these evidentiary proceedings in its back
rooms; the parties were not allowed to be
present; no public record was made of these
proceedings. The purpose of these

<sup>8.</sup> See note 3, supra.

<sup>9.</sup> See note 4, supra.

proceedings was to find evidence to infer that the lives of the unborn were not protected by the U.S. Constitution. An original party objected to these secret judicial proceedings:

the prior market of all sure factors to any

toracl Catemant walls buffle on only cont.

the second of th

a for local transfer transfer and the law parties.

THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE

The Court has taken judicial notice of innumerable facts and factors, some which are expressly referred to in the Court's decision and some which are unknown to the parties but which apparently were extricated from various sources by the Court's diligent research, which facts nevertheless should be subject to refutation and counter-evidence since they form the foundation for the Court's opinion ... of constitutional stages of fetal growth.

But the Court permitted the killings to commence despite this objection to its secret evidentiary proceedings.

And this Court has maintained the killings despite repeated objections that it used secret evidentiary proceeding in Roe v. Wade. 11

<sup>10.</sup> Petition for Rehearing 4, Doe v. Bolton, 410 U.S. 179 (1973), denied 410 U.S. 959 (1973).

<sup>11.</sup> See cases in note 2, supra.

proceedings was to dind evidence to infer

that the lives of the outer wat and

na .notinglianco .c.U. may yet betterion. An

dending berry objected to these desiret

Inharp brokenithan.

Innumerable facts and factors, some

Cours's decision and some which are

HOLL DESCRIPTION OF A PROPERTY OF THE GRAND BUILDRY

of socidue ed blooms easientreven

they form the Torontellan for the

Court is spinted . . . of ognet thutlons!

spatially and heatthering report and runs
and of nothing or other allegate a section to the

County of the party of the part

and benis the test true to be the

the sent of do hyronger areguet application

The man and and the second in a

The second secon

The unborn have a constitutional right not to be excluded from the protection of the U.S. Constitution by secret evidentiary proceedings. 12 Judges who willfully deny this right are guilty of crime. 13 This denial makes Roe v. Wade void.

THIS COURT EFFECTED AND MAINTAINED THE ROE

v. WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUTIONALLY
REFUSING TO ALLOW ITS EVIDENCE, WHICH IT

USED TO INFER THAT THE LIVES OF THE UNBORN
ARE NOT PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION,
TO BE CONFRONTED AND CROSS-EXAMINED.

Since the Court used a secret process, the original parties had not seen all the evidence which the Court used to infer that the lives of the unborn are not protected by the U.S. Constitution. An original party asked permission to cross-examine the evidence which the Court used to infer that the lives of the unborn were not protected by the U.S. Constitution:

The Court has taken judicial notice of innumerable facts and factors, some

<sup>12.</sup> See note 3, supra.

<sup>13.</sup> See note 4, supra.

was unburn have a constitutional right

to be excluded from the protection of

the did coastitution by accest authoritary

Anny Alingilla our madner ... Shuttenith gonk

this right, are golley of crimes " This

denial maraw-Red v. made volo.

THE COURT SPERCESS AND MAINTAINED THE POR

ATTACHMENT OF THE BANGS OF ANTONIOR IL

HOLDS AND AND THE REAL OF THE REAL CONSTRUCTION AND

CONTRACT-SEGRE OUT GENERALIST BE OF

The same to be a supplementation of

SALS INTEL ME DONE STORY AND ADDRESS WARRANTS

Distriction of the state of the later of

and national and annual residence and an in-

sens selat of mose from , wit white meaning

Description of the course was to swell out

TOTAL PARAGO BAT SET SE

more alternations whose wintersecond

A POST OF THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF

Court's decision and some which are unknown to the parties but which apparently were extricated from various sources by the Court's diligent research, which facts nevertheless should be subject to refutation and counter-evidence since they form the foundation of the Court's opinion ... of constitutional stages of fetal growth.

which are expressly referred to in the

But the Supreme Court refused to allow the original parties to cross-examine its evidence in Roe v. Wade, which it used to infer that the lives of the unborn were not protected by the U.S. Constitution. Thus the killings commenced.

And this Court has maintained the killings by steadfastly refusing to allow its evidence, which it used to infer that the lives of the unborn were not protected by the U.S. Constitution, to be confronted and cross-examined. 15

<sup>14.</sup> Petition for Rehearing 4, Doe v. Bolton, 410 U.S. 179 (1973), denied 410 U.S. 959 (1973) (emphasis added).

<sup>15.</sup> See cases in note 2, supra.

which are supressly referred to in the Court's decision and some which are unknown to the porties but which are apparently were extricated from warlous remained by the Court's diligent remained, which ingto newer belong about decision and countries and c

Volla of banning town or to all to al

the original pareton to dolor or samples to

senty the translations of the Angelland And Angelland

The state of the s

lade talks as bonn at course and

ori saines liverille

Andrew Street, Street,

The unborn have a constitutional right to confront and cross-examine the evidence which this Court used to infer that their lives are not protected by the U.S. Constitution. 16 Judges who willfully deny this right are guilty of crime. 17 This denial makes Roe v. Wade void.

THIS COURT EFFECTED AND MAINTAINED THE ROE v. WADE KILLINGS BY UNCONSTITUTIONALLY REFUSING TO ALLOW EVIDENCE TO BE PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE UNBORN TO ESTABLISH THEIR RIGHT TO LIFE UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

In Roe v. Wade, the Court invented new constitutional standards on the protection of life by the U.S. Constitution, which the parties did not see until after Roe v. Wade was decided. The parties never had opportunity to present evidence under these new standards. An original party asked permission to present evidence under the new constitutional standards, which it had not seen before, to show that the lives of

<sup>16.</sup> See note 3, supra.

<sup>17.</sup> See note 4, supra.

The confront and cross-examine the evidence which this Court wood to infer that their lives are not protected by the U.S.

Constitution. Is sudges who willfully deny this right are quilty of orige. It role

denial makes Hos v. Ends void.

5.

THIS COURT REFERENCED AND MAISTAINED THE ROC

REFURING TO ALLOW EVIDENCE TO BE PRESENTED ON BEREIF OF THE UNBORN TO STRADES THEY HELD

in Ros v. Mode, the Court towented new

constitutional standards on the protection of life by the U.S. Constitution, which the

parties ald not see ontil after Eur v. Made

opportunity to present swidence under those

bester wind landging on , which name un-

has at decide the present witherest

to savil and dedd wode of pareind ness ton

16. Sam note 3, supre- 31

- Alden Vy made and - Ad-

the unborn are protected by the U.S.

Constitution:

We are dealing here with a procedure long considered outlawed and which has suddenly become become legal.

The Court has selected a point in time at which states may protect fetal life, without any record of facts upon which to base the conclusion that only at "viability," as that term is defined by the Court, do the people of a state have authority to demand caution before a prenatal infant is destroyed.

Appellees have had no opportunity to show by evidence in a traditional judicial trial setting at what gestational stage the separate life of the fetus is "meaningful" medically; in addition, the Court overlooked the significance of Georgia's legal recognition of meaningful human life as found in case law and statute.

With no opportunity for Appellees to demonstrate the factual basis, in terms of current medical science, that its interest attaches at a particular point in the natural development of a human fetus, the Court has seized upon the convenient point of "viability" and crystallized constitutional command which bars State action.

In the medical concept of "life," with its current body of technological knowledge, including such advances as fetal electrocardiography and fetal electroencepholography, legal "life" should not be cemented at an event in

the unbuts are protected by the 0.5.

Constitutions

We are dealing here with a procedure long considered outlawed and which has

nuddanly necesse become legal.

The Court has aslacted a point in time

ned which eithout any record of facts upon

which to base the conclusion that only of verschilley," as that term is

do signed by the doutt, do the people of

a state have authority to desend

destroyed. . . beyornash

of Wilderingto on had eved easileday

tedicial trial setting at what

entational stage the separationally

in addition, the Court overlooked the

recognition of meaninging numer itse

of and Lagge for water top appealing to

terms of current medical actors, that

a in inampoleved issues and at into-

"Ydlildaly" to salog sanianyses eas

and oryminalization committee action.

"redill" to describe teather and at

wath the outrette wedy of tychnological

Taral one veletared three part of the later

of Justy as he hadowend and Jon blyone

a judicial conclusion which does not have the benefit of medical evidence.

At any rate, Appellees should have an opportunity to present evidence and testimony to support the State's claim of medically and scientifically sound interest in requiring a cautious approach to the extinguishment of fetal life.18

But the Court refused to allow the original parties to present evidence to show that the lives of the unborn were protected by the U.S. Constitution. Thus the killings commenced.

And this Court has maintained the killings by steadfastly refusing to allow evidence to be presented on behalf of the unborn to prove that their lives are protected by the U.S. Constitution.19

The unborn have a constitutional right to present evidence in this case to prove that their lives are protected by the U.S.

<sup>18.</sup> Petition for Rehearing 3,4,5,6,8, Doe v. Bolton, 410 U.S. 179 (1973), denied 410 U.S. 959 (1973).

<sup>19.</sup> See cases in note 2, supra.

Constitution. 20 Judges who willfully deny this right are guilty of crime. 21 This denial makes Roe v. Wade void.

The procedures used by the Court to effect and maintain the Roe v. Wade killings are essentially the same procedures cited by the Nuremberg Court as part of the evidence to convict the Nazi judges of complicity in extermination and murder. 22

all gaments not prevented by the ourtless to

s judicial conclusion which does not a judicing a judicing the name of medical avidence

ads wolle or needed to sheet the

or sometive inseese on pasting inhibits

wolls or palester placetoned nonlilla

and to Winder on Desagnage adens Chembly of the

IN PERSON FOR REPORTING 3.4.5.5.3. EOB T. S. E

protected by the U.S. Constitution.19

<sup>20.</sup> See note 3, supra.

<sup>21.</sup> See note 4, supra.

<sup>22. &</sup>quot;In many instances they were denied the right to introduce evidence, to be confronted by witnesses against them.... They were ... denied the right of counsel of their own choice .... (T) he accused learned only a few moments before trial of the nature of the alleged crime for which he was to be tried. The entire proceedings from beginning to end were secret and no public record was allowed to be made of them." United States v. Altstoetter, 3 Trials of War Criminals Before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals 1046-1047 (1951). "Such a mock trial is not a judicial proceeding but a murder." Id., at 1164. "The dagger of the assassin was concealed beneath the robe of the jurist." Id. at 985.

II.
ISSUES RAISED BY COUNSEL
NOT RAISED BY THE PARTIES

Constitution. 20 dodges who willfally deny

the right to introduce evidence; to by

nordy tol emino becalls affile and and

dender, set beneath the robe at the jurist.

a Jos al laind spor a drugs . (1981)

1. THE UNIVERSAL GUARANTEE OF LIFE TO "ANY PERSON," MADE BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, DOES INCLUDE THE UNBORN.

The parties have not raised the question of whether the lives of the unborn are protected by the U.S. Constitution, which disposes of all issues in this case.

The unborn have a right to assistance of counsel, to present evidence and arguments not presented by the parties, to show that the universal guarantee of life to "any person," made in the U.S.

Constitution, does include the unborn.

2. THERE IS A GOVERNMENT CONSPIRACY TO IMPOSE ON THIS NATION THE EXACT DOCTRINES WHICH THE UNITED STATES ITSELF CONDEMNED AS MURDER AT NUREMBERG.

At Nuremberg the Nazi judges claimed they could not be held accountable for the murder of millions of Jews, because "the

<sup>23.</sup> This evidence and arguments are presented in the amicus curiae brief by the Legal Defense For Unborn Children and incorporated herein by reference.

TEBUCS RAISED BY COUNSEL NOT HAISED BY THE PARTIES

R.U HET TH BOAR ", MOSERY YEAR OF HELD

The parties have not calsed the

question of whether the lives of the unborn

are protected by the U.S. Constitution,

which disposes of all issues in this case.

ennetatess of indpix a sven names and

of Counsel, to present evidence and

arquaents not presented by the parties, to

able to astronous lawrestes of test wade

any persons' made in the dif.

Constitution, done include the unport.

RESIDENCE TO THE MATTER TAKET COCTAINES

MORDER AT MIRRARESC.

Danielo sebont taga sus manasana av

they could not be here seconstable for the

unries of millions of Jews, because "the

ale standard bas accepted ald? .El

Legal Determs For Unboth Colleton and

supreme judge" of Nazi Germany had decreed those killings to be legal. 24 Under Nazi law, which they had obeyed, those killings were legal. But the United States prosecuted and the Nuremberg court convicted the Nazi judges of participating in a government conspiracy to murder.

Yet the record proves that the U.S.

Supreme Court conspires to impose those exact doctrines on America by decree. This Court decreed killings to be "liberty" which the people had defined by their homicide statutes to be "murder." This Court exactly decreed mass murder to be legal. By merely changing the names of the victims, this Court has duplicated the decree of "the supreme judge" of Nazi Germany.

When the U.S. Supreme Court was accused of mass murder in the United States District

<sup>24.</sup> United States v. Altstoetter, supra, at 983-985.1011-1014.

<sup>25.</sup> See amicus brief by Legal Defense for Unborn Children, filed herein, pages 10-22.

angress judge" of Maxi Sermany had decread thous willings to be legal. 20 Onder Maxi law, which they had obeyed, those killings were legal. - Aut the Soited States prosecuted

ind the Munemberg court convictor the Meri

community to marder

Buprame Court genegites to impose those was the

deline ? grandll? ed of neglitie bearing which

statutes to be "murder." This cours

existly dear to seem add printers of the victims,

this court has duplicated the decree of "the

supreme judge" of wart Court was accused

of mass durder, in the Online States District

181-180 . 1011-1014. . Alleringing . Alexander . Alexandra . Alexa

Mary ten amicum brief by Legal Octonee for Demons Children, Ciled bereing pages 10-22.

Court in Richmond, the U.S. Government claimed that the Supreme Court had the power to decree mass murder to be legal, and the U.S. Government expressly argued that the Supreme Court must be obeyed even if it decreed a liberty to kill Jews. Although the U.S. District Judge objected that Roe v.

[U.S. District Judge]: Let me ask you to respond to this question. The plaintiff argues in his brief that the Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade took a discrete group of entities and said that these entities have no right to live, and thus may be killed .... And he said if you take Roe v. Wade and remove the word "fetus" and just substitute most any other word you want of another discrete group, that we wouldn't be here discussing this at all. Let's say that instead of "fetus," they said "Jews." That is the one he used in his brief.

Would you argue stare decisis to me if, under <u>Roe</u> v. <u>Wade</u>, at the whim of neighbors Jews could be put to death?

[U.S. Govt. Lawyer]: (I) would have to agree with the doctrine of stare decisis and advance it to the court.

<sup>26.</sup> Ernest v. United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, transcript of proceedings at 21-22, cert. denied 475 U.S. 1084 (1986):

Court in Michagna, the U.S. Covernment claimed that has Supreme Court had the nower to decree man sunder to be legal, and the E.S. Government expressly around that the Supreme Court aget be coaved even if it the U.S. District downe objected that Rog V. account we unliked States Attorney for the Esstern Blacking of Virginia, transcript of proceedings at 21-22, cert, senied 475 STARREST ASSESSED. box ... beilly ad var andy bee sayly remove the word facus and sweets they said "Jews." That is the one he midy and to able to got table while and of it somewhat how searons are to

Wade was "the worst decision by the Supreme Court in the history of the Court," the U.S. District Judge adopted the U.S. Government's arguments that he must obey the U.S. Supreme Court no matter who it decreed a liberty to kill. This record proves a conspiracy by both the executive and judicial departments of the government of the United States to impose on this nation the very doctrines which the United States itself condemned as murder at Nuremberg. Yet on review, not one Justice of this Court had any objection to these doctrines. 28

Moreover, each Justice of this Court was named as a defendant in a civil suit, and accused of mass murder in the U.S.

<sup>27.</sup> Ernest v. United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, pet. cert. at A2, cert. denied 475 U.S. 1084 (1986).

<sup>28.</sup> Ernest v. United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Yirginia, cert. denied without comment 475 U.S. 1084 (1986). If any Justice had believed that the doctrines condemned as murder at Nuremberg were not legal in the United States, as claimed by the U.S. Government, he certainly would have noted his objection.

Wade was "the worst degister by the Suprese Court in the distory of the Court," the U.S. District Judge adorted the U.S. Government's arqueents that he must obey the U.S. Supreme north the executive and teletal deportments which the United States tree! I condomice as and don , weiver no dev voyagewight de lebiter dustice of this doors had now objection to . pontreoob ands . Slun livio E ni describio e as forma sev A2, cert. donled A75 U.S. 1084 (1985). 29. States v. Unived-States Attorney for the

condemned at murder of Horestern were not legal to the Childed Drakers as claimed by

neliporde mid beden.

the U.S. Covernment, he certainly would have

District Court in Alexandria. 29 The Justices boldly claimed, through their U.S. Government lawyers, that the U.S. Supreme Court has the power to decree mass murder to be liberty. The Justices further claimed that after the Supreme Court had decreed (without any trial) mass murder of anyone to be liberty, the victims being killed could not even appear in court and challenge the validity of the decree. And the U.S. District Judge adopted this position as law without even permitting a hearing in the cause, or even being able to show one single allegation in the complaint to be wrong in fact or law. Thus, each Justice of this Court boldly claimed the absolute power to decree mass murder to be liberty, by mere decree without trial, no matter who the victims might be, and this is now accepted by all the courts of the United States, the

<sup>29.</sup> Ernest v. Rebnquist. Brennan. White.
Marshall. Blackmun. Stevens. O'Connor.
Scalia. Kennedy, et al, civil No. 89-732-A.

district Court in Alexandria. 29 The

Justices boldly distand, through their U.S.

Covernment lawyers, that the U.S. Suprame

Court has the power to decree mass murder to

be liberty. The Justices further claimed

the Steer the Supreme Court had decreed

(without any trial) mass nurder of anyone to

bloom'belish paind salboly add agreedly

end some finds but stoop al beening neve He

validity of the Wootee, and the U.S.

Matrice Jedge woogsed this position as law

without even permitting a hearing in the

cause, or even being shie to show one single

. sliegablen in the complaint to be wrong in

that or law. Thus, each dustice of this

Court holdly claimed the absolute power to

doorse was murder to be liberty, by more

decree without tels?, no matter who the

Salgoobs won at alds bee tel decle salgoty

by all the courts of the United States, the

31 Einest v. Kebngulst. Brennan, Mbiter

Marahall, Blackmun, Shayans, O'Concor, Scaller Records, et al, civil No. 89-732-A. U.S. Congress, and the President, as the law of the land.

Moreover this has been the steadfast policy of the United States, asperted in court after court, for almost two decades. All the lower judges who have upheld this Court's claim of power to condemn millions to death by decree, are accused of complicity in capital mass murder. 30

30. U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES: Albert V. Bryan, Jr.; Emmett R. Cox; Edward T. Gignoux; Harold H. Greene: J. Thomas Greene: William B. Hand; Joseph C. Howard; Martin F. Loughlin; Robert Earl Maxwell; Louis F. Oberdorfer; Raymond J. Pettine; Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr.: John J. Sirica: James R. Spencer; James C. Turk; D. Dortch Warriner; Don J. Young. U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGES: D.C. Circuit- David L. Bazelon: Carl McGowan: Roger Robb: George E. MacKinnon: Spotswood Robinson III; J. Skelly Wright; Edward A. Tamm: Malcolm R. Wilkey. First Circuit-Levin H. Campbell; Frank M. Coffin; Hugh H. Bownes; Stephen G. Breyer. Fourth Circuit-Harrison L. Winter; Donald S. Russell; H. Emory Widener, Jr., Kenneth K. Hall; James D. Phillips, Jr.; Francis D. Murnaghan, Jr.; James M. Sprouse; Sam J. Brvin, II; Robert F. Chapman. Eleventh Circuit- John C. Godbold; Paul H. Roney; Gerald B. Tjoflat; James C. Hill; Peter T. Pay; Robert S. Vance; Phyllis A. Kravitch; Prank M. Johnson, Jr.; Albert J. Henderson, Jr.; Joseph W. Hatchett: R. Lanier Anderson, III; Thomas A. Clark. AND the judges in Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton who decreed a

B.S. Congress, and the President, as the law of the Land. Moreover this has been the stendisst polloy of the United States, asserbed in court after court, for almost two decades. All the lower redons who have upheld this court's civia of power to condemn millions to death by decree, are accused of . desplicity in captial mass murger, 10 30. U.S. BISTRICT SUNCES: Albert V. Biyan, Jr.: Emmett R. Cox; Edward T. Gignovx; Harold H. Greener J. Thomas Greener William B. Hands Joseph C. Howard: Markin F. Longhismy Robert Sarl Maxwell: Louis ?. Obeidorfer: Raymond J. Pettine; Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr. & John J. Siricar James B. Spencer; James C. Turk; D. Bortch Warriner; Don D. Found. U.S. CIRCUIT JUNGES: D.C. Circuit- David L. Barelon; Carl McGovan; Score Robbs George E. Mackingon: Spotswood Robinson III; J. Skelly Wridber Edward AD Levin H. Campbell: Frank M. Coffins Bogh H. Bowness Stephen G. Brever, Pourch Circuit-Smory Widenest Jr. : Reposth K. Sally James Jaces H. Sprapas; firm C. Ervin, III Robert P. Chapman. Sleventh Circuit- John C. James C. Will: Peter T. Pay: Robert S. Vancor Phyllip A. Eravitch: Fronk B. Whomas A. Glark. Ald the Bedger in Ros va

The U.S. Congress has also joined the conspiracy to impose these doctrines on the United States. When the Congress held hearings on Roe v. Wade, it conspired to allow all the false evidence in Roe v. Wade to be presented, but refused to allow the rebuttal to be presented, and thus Congress conspired to present falsehood to the nation as if it were the truth. Moreover Congress has deliberately defied its constitutional duty to control this Court, knowing full well that its defiance would directly contribute to the death of the victims. Thus leaders of Congress have joined the federal judicial and executive departments in this gigantic conspiracy.31

<sup>&</sup>quot;liberty" to kill the unborn without any investigation to see if their lives were protected by the Constitution: Circuit Judges Morgan and Goldberg; District Judges Smith, Henderson, Hughes and Taylor.

<sup>31.</sup> The complaint (supra note 29) at para. 6 p.3, alleged that various members of the committees on the Judiciary, whose particular duty was to control the courts, were a part of the conspiracy: "The coconspirators include ex-Chairman Peter Rodino, Chairman Rep. Jack Brooks,

sonapiracy no impost these doctrines on the United States, When the Congress held could be the the the thirty of the violing. This committees on the Judiciary, whose and the and forther educate and allesided so mil's averalgement ens to dame p save congulators include ex-Challenn sichel

The leaders of all three branches of the government of the United States escape the accusation that they conspired to commit capital mass murder - to kill children in violation of murder statutes - by merely claiming the same defense, using the very same words, which the United States itself condemned as murder at Nuremberg. This is surely the signal event in the history of mankind's search for a government of laws, and not of men.

This is a conspiracy by leaders of the judicial, executive and legislative branches of the government of the United States: (1) to claim the absolute power to decree mass murder to be legal, (2) to claim that if the Supreme Court decreed the killing of Jews (or any victims whatever) to be legal, the whole nation must obey, and (3) to supplant

subcommittee chairman Rep. Don Edwards, subcommittee chairman Rep. Robert Kastenmeier; Chairman Sen. Joseph Biden, ex-Chairman Sen. Edward Kennedy. A jury could find this conspiracy to be murder."

the U.S. Constitution as the supreme law of the land, and to impose the legal system on the United States by judicial fiat, which

Leaders of the national news media have also joined the conspiracy. Even though the U.S. Supreme Court was accused of mass murder in The Washington Post, 32 and the Court never attempted to prove a word of the accusation to be wrong, that newspaper continued its policy of editorially supporting the killings despite repeated notices its encouragement could amount to complicity in mass murder.33

the leaders of all three branches of

violeting of surder statutes - by serely

to claim the ampigue, power to decree many

Appendantage chalges Rop. Poberk

. 190 yes od od yeszigunou sida bail bileta

<sup>32. &</sup>quot;WASHINGTON LAWYER CHARGES U.S. SUPREME COURT WITH MASS MURDER," published in The Washington Post, Sept 12, 1979, page A6.

<sup>33.</sup> The Washington Post has been warned almost 100 times that advocacy of murder is not free speech; that even a sincere belief that Roe v. Wade is good law is no defense, since ignorance of the law is no excuse, and the narrow exception of reasonable reliance on a court decision does not apply in homicide cases. See authorities in amicus brief (supra note 25) at p.62 n.6. And while The Washington Post supported the killings, it covered up news unparalleled in world history - that the U.S. Government claimed the power to decree a liberty to kill Jews, or anyone - by mere decree without trial.

the U.S. Constitution so the storens law of the land, and th legger the leggl system on Lendars of the national news wedla have aisa tolayed the demoplisacy. Even though the at loby in to you cover that seems of mirder is

when washington load aspect of the allings,

In explaining how the monstrous crimes of the Nazi regime went unchecked, Winston Churchill merely quoted Machiavelli: "Men avenge slight injuries, but not grave ones." In this manner America is ruled by a giant conspiracy to commit mass murder, which consists of leaders of all three branches of the federal government, and leaders of the national news media. That the United States can be ruled for two decades by a giant conspiracy to mass murder is the most catastrophic crime in the recorded history of the world, which now draws a terrifying darkness over the future of all mankind.

# CONCLUSION

The Court is moved to allow counsel to represent the unborn and defend their right to life under the U.S. Constitution.

Alan Ernest, Counsel